arXiv:hep-ph/9905222v3 24 Jun 1999

Renormalization-Group Effects in the SO(3) Gauge Model With Nearly Degenerate Neutrino Masses and Bi-maximal Mixing

Yue-Liang Wu*
Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing 100080, P.R. China

AS-ITP-99-11, hep-ph/9905222

Abstract

The renormalization-group effects on the scenario with nearly degenerate mass and bi-maximal mixing of neutrinos are analyzed. As a consequence, we explicitly show in the SO(3) gauge model that the renormalization-group effects could modify the fitting values of the relevant basic parameters of the model, but leave the nearly bi-maximal mixing scenario to remain stable for reconciling both solar and atmospheric neutrino data. The approximately degenerate Majorana neutrino masses are allowed to be large enough to play a significant cosmological role without conflicting with the current neutrinoless double beta decay.

PACS numbers: 12.15F, 11.30H

---

*YLWU@ITP.AC.CN

Evidences for oscillation of atmospheric neutrinos [1] and for deficit of solar neutrinos[2] provide strong indications that neutrinos are massive. If there exist only three light neutrinos, the mixing matrix is likely to be nearly bi-maximal with approximately degenerate masses [4, 5, 6, 7] in order to simultaneously satisfy the requirements that both solar and atmospheric neutrino flux anomalous are explained by neutrino oscillations, and the evolution of the large-scale structure of the universe[3] gets significant contributions from massive neutrinos. It has also been noticed [5] that these remarkable features will result in a nice form for neutrino mass matrix in the weak gauge and charged lepton mass basis. Such a nice form of the neutrino mass matrix could be generated by using continuous or discrete symmetries[6, 7]. In ref. [6], we have shown that a realistic scheme with nearly degenerate neutrino masses and bi-maximal mixing can be derived in the simple extension of the standard model with gauged SO(3) lepton flavor symmetry. The mass-squared difference Δm^2_{sun} required from solar neutrinos is usually much smaller than the one Δm^2_{atm} from the atmospheric neutrinos, i.e., $\Delta m^2_{sun} \ll \Delta m^2_{atm}$. Numerically, the values of Δm^2_{sun} are of order $\Delta m^2_{sun} \sim 10^{-4} - 10^{-5} eV^2$ for matter enhanced MSW solutions[10] with large mixing angle[11], and of order $10^{-10} - 10^{-11} eV^2$ for vacuum oscillation solutions[12, 13]. In such a situation, the renormalization group effects must be considered. Recently, it has been shown[8] that, for the fixed pattern of neutrino mixing, the bi-maximal mixing is not stable due to renormalization group effects, and the renormalized masses and mixing angles are not compatible with all the experimental constraints. The same subject has also been studied in [9], similar (negative) conclusions have been reached, however, it has been found that when the general see-saw scenario as the mechanism responsible for generating the effective neutrino mass matrix, some positive results could be obtained in large regions of the parameter space consistent with the large angle MSW solution. In this note, we will explicitly show that in the SO(3) gauge model the renormalization group effects could modify the fitting values of the relevant basic parameters of the model, but the scenario with nearly degenerate mass and bi-maximal mixing of neutrinos could remain stable to accommodate both solar and atmospheric neutrino data, and the neutrino masses could still be large enough to play a significant cosmological role without conflicting with the current neutrinoless double beta decays.

We start from a general consideration. Let M_e and M_ν are mass matrices of charged-leptons and neutrinos respectively, they are defined as $\mathcal{L}_m = \bar{e}_L M_e e_R + \bar{\nu}_L M_\nu \nu^c_L + H.c.$. M_e can always be written as $M_e = U_e D_e V_e^\dagger$ with U_e and V_e the two unitary matrices and $D_e = diag.(m_e.m_\mu, m_\tau)$ the diagonal mass matrix for the charged leptons. When the CKM-type lepton mixing matrix is mainly determined from the charged lepton mass matrix, i.e., the unitary matrix $U_e^\dagger$, and the neutrino masses are nearly degenerate, then the neutrino mass matrix can be written as

$$M_\nu = m_0 \left(I_3 + \epsilon_\nu S_\nu \right) \tag{1}$$

where I_3 is an 3×3 unit matrix, m_0 is a mass parameter with $m_0 = O(1)$ eV and S_ν is a symmetric matrix with matrix elements being order of one. Thus ϵ_ν is a small paramter $\epsilon_\nu \ll 1$.

In the weak gauge and charged-lepton mass basis, the neutrino mass matrix is given by

$$\tilde{M}_\nu \equiv U_e^\dagger M_\nu U_e = m_0 \left(U_e^\dagger U_e^* + \epsilon_\nu U_e^\dagger S_\nu U_e^* \right) \tag{2}$$

In this basis, when the renormalization group equations evaluate from the high energy scale Λ to the electroweak scale, the renormalized neutrino mass matrix is simply given by

$$\begin{aligned} M_\nu^R &= R\tilde{M}_\nu R = \hat{m}_0 \{ U_e^\dagger U_e^* + \epsilon_\nu U_e^\dagger S_\nu U_e^* - \epsilon_R D U_e^\dagger U_e^* - \epsilon_R U_e^\dagger U_e^* D \\ &- \epsilon_R \epsilon_\nu D U_e^\dagger S_\nu U_e^* - \epsilon_R \epsilon_\nu U_e^\dagger S_\nu U_e^* D \\ &+ \epsilon_R^2 D U_e^\dagger U_e^* D + \epsilon_R^2 \epsilon_\nu D U_e^\dagger S_\nu U_e^* D \} \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

with $R = diag.(R_e, R_\mu, R_\tau) \equiv R_e(I_3 + \epsilon_R D)$ and

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \epsilon & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{4}$$

where $\epsilon_R = 1 - R_\tau/R_e$, $\epsilon = (1 - R_\mu/R_e)/\epsilon_R$ and $\hat{m}_0 = R_e m_0$. R_f $(f = e, \mu, \tau)$ are the Yukawa renormalization factors[8] and defined as

$$R_f = exp[\frac{1}{16\pi^2} \int_{t_0}^{t} h_f^2 dt] \tag{5}$$

with $t = \ln \mu$ and h_f $(f = e, \mu, \tau)$ being the Yukawa coupling constants of the charged leptons. By a unitary transformation $\nu_L \to U_e^\dagger \nu_L$, the mass matrix becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{M}_\nu &\equiv U_e M_\nu^R U_e^T = \hat{m}_0 \{ I_3 + \epsilon_\nu S_\nu - \epsilon_R (\hat{D} + \hat{D}^*) \\ &- \epsilon_R \epsilon_\nu (\hat{D} S_\nu + S_\nu \hat{D}^*) + \epsilon_R^2 \hat{D}\hat{D}^* + \epsilon_R^2 \epsilon_\nu \hat{D} S_\nu \hat{D}^* \} \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

with $\hat{D} = U_e D U_e^\dagger$. In general, the resulting value for ϵ_R and ϵ are small, i.e., $\epsilon_R \ll 1$ and $\epsilon \ll 1$. Thus the neutrino masses should remain almost degenerate, but the fitting values of the relevant parameters appearing in the matrix S_ν have to be modified. To be manifest, we shall consider an explicit scenario discussed in our recent papers [6]. From there we can read

$$U_e^\dagger \simeq \begin{pmatrix} ic_1 & -s_1 & 0 \\ c_2 s_1 & -ic_1 c_2 & -s_2 \\ s_1 s_2 & -ic_1 s_2 & c_2 \end{pmatrix} \tag{7}$$

and

$$S_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} r_\Delta s_1^2 & 0 & 2r_\delta s_2 c_2 \\ 0 & r_\Delta c_1^2 & 0 \\ 2r_\delta s_2 c_2 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{8}$$

with $\epsilon_\nu \equiv \Delta_+$, $r_\Delta \equiv \Delta_-/\Delta_+$ and $r_\delta \equiv \delta_-/\Delta_+$. Here $\Delta_\pm = \delta_+ \pm \delta_- \cos 2\theta_2$ with δ_+ and δ_- the two basic parameters of the model. It is not difficult to check that the matrix $\hat{D} = U_e D U_e^\dagger$ has the following explicit form

$$\hat{D} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{s}_2^2 s_1^2 & i\hat{s}_2^2 c_1 s_1 & r s_1 c_2 s_2 \\ i\hat{s}_2^2 c_1 s_1 & -\hat{s}_2^2 c_1^2 & irc_1 c_2 s_2 \\ r s_1 c_2 s_2 & irc_1 c_2 s_2 & \hat{s}_2^2 \end{pmatrix} \tag{9}$$

with $\hat{s}_2^2 = s_2^2 + \epsilon c_2^2$ and $r = 1 - \epsilon$. It is seen that to the linear terms of ϵ_ν and ϵ_R the neutrino mass matrix $\hat{M}_\nu$ has the same structure as M_ν, thus the mass matrix $\hat{M}_\nu$ can be written in the following form

$$\hat{M}_\nu = \hat{m}_0 \{ I_3 + \hat{\epsilon}_\nu \hat{S}_\nu - \epsilon_R \epsilon_\nu (\hat{D} S_\nu + S_\nu \hat{D}^*) + \epsilon_R^2 \hat{D} \hat{D}^* + \epsilon_R^2 \epsilon_\nu \hat{D} S_\nu \hat{D}^* \} \tag{10}$$

with

$$\hat{S}_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{r}_\Delta s_1^2 & 0 & 2\hat{r}_\delta s_2 c_2 \\ 0 & \hat{r}_\Delta c_1^2 & 0 \\ 2\hat{r}_\delta s_2 c_2 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{11}$$

and $\hat{\epsilon}_\nu \equiv \hat{\Delta}_+$, $\hat{r}_\Delta \equiv \hat{\Delta}_- / \hat{\Delta}_+$, $\hat{r}_\delta \equiv \hat{\delta}_- / \hat{\Delta}_+$. Here $\hat{\Delta}_\pm = \Delta_\pm - \epsilon_R \hat{s}_2^2$ and $\hat{\delta}_- = \delta_- - r s_1 \epsilon_R$.

It is seen that when only keeping to the first order of ϵ_ν and ϵ_R, the scenario with nearly degenerate neutrino masses and bi-maximal mixing is automatically preserved. The only difference is that one shall use the modified parameters $\hat{\Delta}_\pm = \Delta_\pm - \epsilon_R \hat{s}_2^2$ and $\hat{\delta}_- = \delta_- - r s_1 \epsilon_R$, instead of the parameters $\Delta_\pm$ and δ_-, to accommodate the experimental data. The resulting constraints in this approximation are given by

$$\hat{\Delta}_+ - \hat{\Delta}_- c_1^2 \simeq \Delta m_{atm}^2 / 2 m_0^2 \tag{12}$$

and

$$|\hat{\delta}_- \sin 2\theta_2| \ll |\hat{\Delta}_+ - \hat{\Delta}_- s_1^2| \tag{13}$$

Considering $s_2 \simeq c_2$ and $s_1 \simeq c_1$, these constraints can be simplified to be

$$\delta_+ - \epsilon_R \hat{s}_2^2 \simeq \Delta m_{atm}^2 / m_0^2 \tag{14}$$

and

$$c_1^2 - s_1^2 + \left(\frac{\delta_- - r \epsilon_R s_1}{(\delta_+ - \epsilon_R \hat{s}_2^2) c_1} \right)^2 \simeq \frac{\Delta m_{sun}^2}{2 \Delta m_{atm}^2} \tag{15}$$

with $m_0 \simeq O(1)$ eV. The question is how the higher order terms affect the stability of the scenario. For convenience of discussions, we may change the basis by a phase redifinition $e_L \to i e_L$ and $\nu_{\mu L} \to i \nu_{\mu L}$, so that the lepton mixing matrix becomes orthogonal

$$U_e^\dagger \to O_e^T \simeq \begin{pmatrix} c_1 & s_1 & 0 \\ c_2 s_1 & -c_1 c_2 & -s_2 \\ s_1 s_2 & -c_1 s_2 & c_2 \end{pmatrix} \tag{16}$$

and the neutrino mass matrix gets the following general form

$$\hat{M}_\nu = m_0 \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \hat{\epsilon}_\nu \hat{r}_\Delta s_1^2 + a_1 \epsilon_R^2 & b_1 \epsilon_R^2 & 2\hat{\epsilon}_\nu \hat{r}_\delta s_2 c_2 + b_2 \epsilon_R^2 \\ b_1 \epsilon_R^2 & -1 - \hat{\epsilon}_\nu \hat{r}_\Delta c_1^2 - a_2 \epsilon_R^2 & b_3 \epsilon_R^2 \\ 2\hat{\epsilon}_\nu \hat{r}_\delta s_2 c_2 + b_2 \epsilon_R^2 & b_3 \epsilon_R^2 & 1 + \hat{\epsilon}_\nu + a_3 \epsilon_R^2 \end{pmatrix} \tag{17}$$

where the coefficients a_i and b_i (i=1,2,3) are given by s_1 and s_2, and contain higher order terms of ϵ_R. Before going to a detailed discussion, we consider the following 2×2 matrix

$$M \simeq m_0 \begin{pmatrix} -1 - \epsilon_1 & \epsilon_2 \\ \epsilon_2 & 1 + \epsilon_3 \end{pmatrix} \tag{18}$$

which is diagonalized by an 2×2 rotational matrix. The rotational angle θ is given by

$$\tan 2\theta = 2\epsilon_2/(2+\epsilon_1+\epsilon_3) \tag{19}$$

The eigenvalues are

$$\begin{aligned} m_1 &= m_0\left(-\sqrt{1+\epsilon_1+\epsilon_3+\epsilon_2^2+(\epsilon_3-\epsilon_1)^2/4}+(\epsilon_3-\epsilon_1)/2\right) \\ m_2 &= m_0\left(\sqrt{1+\epsilon_1+\epsilon_3+\epsilon_2^2+(\epsilon_3-\epsilon_1)^2/4}+(\epsilon_3-\epsilon_1)/2\right) \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

The mass-squared difference is propotional to $(\epsilon_3 - \epsilon_1)$

$$\Delta m^2 \equiv m_2^2 - m_1^2 = 2m_0^2(\epsilon_3-\epsilon_1)\sqrt{1+\epsilon_1+\epsilon_3+\epsilon_2^2+(\epsilon_3-\epsilon_1)^2/4} \tag{21}$$

when $|\epsilon_i| \ll 1$, one has

$$\Delta m^2 \equiv m_2^2 - m_1^2 \simeq 2m_0(M_{22}+M_{11}) \tag{22}$$

Obviously, when $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_3$, , i.e., $M_{11} = -M_{22}$, one has $m_1 = -m_2$ and $\Delta m^2 \equiv m_2^2 - m_1^2 = 0$. Noticing this feature, we now return to discuss the realistic neutrino mass matrix $\hat{M}_\nu$. As the first step, we transfer the '23' texture into zero via an orthogonal transformation O_{23},

$$O_{23} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_2' & s_2' \\ 0 & -s_2' & c_2' \end{pmatrix} \tag{23}$$

with

$$\tan 2\theta_2' = \frac{2b_3\epsilon_R^2}{2+\epsilon_\nu(1+\hat{r}_\Delta c_1^2)+(a_2+a_3)\epsilon_R^2} \tag{24}$$

so that the mass matrix $\hat{M}_\nu' \equiv O_{23}^T \hat{M}_\nu O_{23}$ has the following form

$$\hat{M}_\nu' = m_0 \begin{pmatrix} 1+\hat{\epsilon}_\nu \hat{r}_\Delta s_1^2 + a_1'\epsilon_R^2 & b_1'\epsilon_R^2 & 2\hat{\epsilon}_\nu\hat{r}_\delta s_2 c_2 + b_2'\epsilon_R^2 \\ b_1'\epsilon_R^2 & -1-\hat{\epsilon}_\nu\hat{r}_\Delta c_1^2 - a_2'\epsilon_R^2 & 0 \\ 2\hat{\epsilon}_\nu\hat{r}_\delta s_2 c_2 + b_2'\epsilon_R^2 & 0 & 1+\hat{\epsilon}_\nu + a_3'\epsilon_R^2 \end{pmatrix} \tag{25}$$

with $a_i' = a_i + \alpha_i \epsilon_R^2$ and $b_i' = b_i + \beta_i \epsilon_R^2$ (i=1,3). Where α_i and β_i are relevant to the angle θ_2'. To accommodate the experimental data, a simple treatment is to set

$$\begin{aligned} &(\hat{M}_\nu')_{13} = m_0\left(2\epsilon_\nu\hat{r}_\delta s_2 c_2 + b_2'\epsilon_R^2\right) = 0 \\ &(\hat{M})_{33}^2 - (\hat{M})_{22}^2 = 2m_0^2[(1-\hat{r}_\Delta c_1^2)\hat{\epsilon}_\nu + (a_3'-a_2')\epsilon_R^2] \simeq \Delta m_{atm}^2 \\ &(\hat{M}_\nu')_{11} + (\hat{M}_\nu')_{22} = m_0[(s_1^2-c_1^2)\hat{\epsilon}_\nu\hat{r}_\Delta + (a_1'-a_2')\epsilon_R^2] \simeq -\Delta m_{sun}^2/2m_0 \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

By an explicit evaluation, we arrive at the following constraints

$$\delta_- = r s_1 \epsilon_R + O(\epsilon_R^2) \tag{27}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\delta_+[1-2\hat{s}_2^2(1+c_1^2)\epsilon_R]s_1^2 - \hat{s}_2^2 s_1^2\epsilon_R = \Delta m_{atm}^2/2m_0^2 \\
&\qquad -\delta_-\{[1+c_1^2+2(1+c_1^4)\hat{s}_2^2\epsilon_R](c_2^2-s_2^2) - r s_1 \sin 2\theta_2\epsilon_R\} \\
&\qquad -[\hat{s}_2^2 + 0.25r^2c_1^2\sin 2\theta_2 + (0.25r^2\sin 2\theta_2 + \hat{s}_2^2c_1^2)(s_1^2-c_1^2)]\epsilon_R^2 + O(\epsilon_R^4) \qquad (28) \\
&[\delta_+(1-2\hat{s}_2^2\epsilon_R) - \hat{s}_2^2\epsilon_R - \delta_-(1-2\hat{s}_2^2\epsilon_R)(c_2^2-s_2^2) + \hat{s}_2^2\epsilon_R^2](s_1^2-c_1^2) \\
&\qquad = (\delta_- s_1 - 0.25r\epsilon_R)r\sin 2\theta_2\epsilon_R - \Delta m_{sun}^2/2m_0^2 + O(\epsilon_R^4) \qquad (29)
\end{aligned}$$

Considering the maximal mixing suggested from the atmospheric neutrino oscillation, i.e., $\theta_2 = \pi/4$, the above constraints are simplified to be

$$\delta_+ = \frac{\Delta m_{atm}^2}{2s_1^2m_0^2} + \epsilon_R/2 + \frac{c_1^2\epsilon_R^2/2}{1-(1+c_1^2)\epsilon_R} + \frac{c_1^2}{4s_1^2}\epsilon_R^2 + O(\epsilon_R^3) \qquad (30)$$

and

$$\{\frac{4\Delta m_{atm}^2}{m_0^2} + 2(1+s_1^2)(c_1^2-s_1^2)\epsilon_R^2 + O(\epsilon_R^3)\}(s_1^2-c_1^2) = 2s_1^2[\epsilon_R^2 - \frac{2\Delta m_{sun}^2}{m_0^2} + O(\epsilon_R^4)] \qquad (31)$$

The most recent upper limit from the neutrinoless double beta decay[14] leads the constraint on the mixing angle θ_1 to be

$$|s_1^2 - c_1^2| < 0.2eV/m_0 \qquad (32)$$

which implies that for $m_0 = O(1)$ eV the renormalization group factor ϵ_R must satisfy the following condition

$$\epsilon_R^2 < \frac{0.2eV/m_0}{1+0.2eV/m_0}\,\frac{4\Delta m_{atm}^2}{m_0^2} + \frac{2\Delta m_{sun}^2}{m_0^2} \qquad (33)$$

For $\Delta m_{atm}^2 \simeq 2.5\times 10^{-3}eV^2$ and $\Delta m_{sun}^2 \ll \Delta m_{atm}^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\epsilon_R^2 < 2.3\times 10^{-4}, \qquad for \qquad m_0 = 2eV, \\
&\epsilon_R^2 < 1.7\times 10^{-3}, \qquad for \qquad m_0 = 1eV \qquad (34)
\end{aligned}$$

In the SO(3) gauge model, the leptons get masses after the SO(3) gauge symmetry breaking down at the energy scale $\Lambda \geq 10^5$ GeV[6]. From the numerical values of the Yukawa renormalization factors calculated in ref.[8], one sees that the renormalization group effects lead to $\epsilon_R \simeq 10^{-6} \sim 10^{-2}$ and $\epsilon \simeq 0 \sim 5\times 10^{-2}$ for $\tan\beta = 1 \sim 60$ in the minimal supersymmetric standard model. From the table 2 in ref.[8], one can read off the following results

$$\begin{aligned}
&\epsilon_R^2 \leq 1.8\times 10^{-4}, \qquad for \qquad \tan\beta \leq 58 \\
&\epsilon_R^2 < 10^{-9}, \qquad for \qquad \tan\beta < 10 \qquad (35)
\end{aligned}$$

which is consistent with the above constraint.

It is seen that for large $\tan\beta$ the parameter space is reasonable for a large angle MSW solution of solar neutrinos even when $s_1^2 = c_1^2$. For low $\tan\beta$, the above constraints can be further simplified to be

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_- &\simeq \epsilon_R/\sqrt{2}, \\ \delta_+ &\simeq \frac{\Delta m^2_{atm}}{m_0^2} + \epsilon_R/2 \ , \\ s_1^2 - c_1^2 &\simeq \frac{m_0^2\epsilon_R^2}{4\Delta m^2_{atm}} - \frac{\Delta m^2_{sun}}{2\Delta m^2_{atm}} \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

When $s_1^2 = c_1^2$, only vacuum oscillation solutions could be allowed at very low $\tan\beta$. For a large angle MSW solution, we then obtain at low $\tan\beta$ the following relation between the mixing angle θ_1 and the mass-squared diffenrences

$$c_1^2 - s_1^2 \simeq \frac{\Delta m^2_{sun}}{2\Delta m^2_{atm}} \tag{37}$$

which indicates that the mixing angle θ_1 is nearly maximal. Note that the above constraints have been obtained by setting $(\hat{M}'_\nu)_{13} = 0$. For $\epsilon_R^2 \ll \Delta m^2_{sun}/2m_0^2$, the renormalization group effects become less important. In this situation, one can also consider the reasonable approximation presented in eqs. (12) and (13). Thus the allowed range of the parameter space will be given by eqs. (14) and (15). In such a case, the mixing angle θ_1 can be maximal.

With the above analyses, we may come to the conclusion that when the renormalization group effects are considered, the realistic scenario with approximately degenerate mass and nearly bi-maximal mixing of neutrinos in the SO(3) gauge model can still be preserved to accommodate both solar and atmospheric neutrino data via vacuum oscillation solutions or large angle MSW solutions. As a consequence, the fitting values of the relevant basic parameters of the model will be modified.

Ackowledgments: This work was supported in part by the NSF of China under the grant No. 19625514.

References

[1] Super-Kamiokande Collaboration, Y.Fukuda *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1562 (1998).

[2] Super-Kamiokande Collaboration, Y.Fukuda *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1158 (1998).

[3] J.R. Primack and M. A. K. Gross, astro-ph/9810204, to be published in the proceedings of the Xth Rencontres de Blois, “The Birth of Galaxies”, 28 June - 4 July 1998; J.R. Primack, J. Holtzman, A. Klypin and D.O. Caldwell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74** 2160 (1995).

[4] D. Caldwell and R.N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 3259 (1993);
A.S. Joshipura, Z. Phys. **C64**, 31 (1994);
A. Ioannisian and J.W.F. Valle, Phys. Lett. **B332**, 93 (1994);
G.K. Leontaris, S. Lola, C. Scheich and J.D. Vergados, Phys. Rev. **D53**, 6381 (1996);
C. Carone and M. Sher, Phys. Lett. **B420**, 83 (1998);
S. Lola and J.D. Vergados, Progr. Part. Nucl. Phys. **40**, 71 (1998);
V. Barger, S. Pakavasa, T. Weiler and K. Whisnant, Phys. Lett. **B437**, 107 (1998);
B.C. Allanach, hep-ph/9806294;
R.N. Mohapatra and S. Nussinov, Phys. Lett. **B441**, 299 (1998); hep-ph/9809415;
G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, Phys. Lett. **B439**, 112 (1998); JHEP 9811, 021 (1998);
J.P. Bowes and R.R. Volkas, J. Phys. **G24**, 1249 (1998);
S. Davidson and S. King, Phys. Lett. **B445**, 191 (1998);
A. J. Baltz, A.S. Goldhaber and M. Goldhaber, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5730 (1998);
H. Fritzsch and Z.Xing, Phys. Lett. **B440**, 313 (1998); hep-ph/9903499;
M. Tonimoto, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 017304 (1998);
C. Jarlskog, M. Matsuda and S. Skadhauge, hep-ph/9812282;
E.Ma, hep-ph/9812344; hep-ph/9902392;
Y. Nomura and T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 017303 (1999);
N. Haba, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 035011 (1999);
C. Giunti, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 077301 (1999);
S.K. Kang and C.S. Kim, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 091302 (1999);
E.M. Lipmanov, hep-ph/9901316;
T. Ohlsson and H. Snellman, hep-ph/9903252;
A.H. Guth, L. Randal and M. Serna, hep-ph/9903464;
M. Jezabek and Y. Sumino, hep-ph/9904382.

[5] H. Georgi and Glashow, hep-ph/9808293;
F. Vissani, hep-ph/9708483.

[6] Y.L Wu, hep-ph/9810491 to appear in Phys. Rev. D;
hep-ph/9901245, to appear in Eur. Phys. J. C.;
hep-ph/9901320; hep-ph/9906435.

[7] C. Wetterich, hep-ph/9812426;
R. Barbieri, L.J. Hall, G.L. Kane, and G. G. Ross, hep-ph/9901228.

[8] J. Ellis and S. Lola, hep-ph/9904279.

[9] J.A. Casas, J.R. Espinosa, A. Ibarra and I. Navarro, hep-ph/9904395; hep-ph/9904395.

[10] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. **D17** 2369 (1978);
S.P. Mikheyev and A. Yu. Smirnov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 42 913 (1986).

[11] K. Inoue, Talk at 8th Int. Workshop "Neutrino Telescopes", Venice, February, 1999;
J.N. Bahcall and P.I. Krastev, Phys. Lett. **B436**, 243 (1998);
J.N. Bahcall, P. Krastev and A.Yu. Smirnov, Phys. Rev. **D58**, 096016 (1998).

[12] V. Barger, R.J.N. Philips and K. Whisnant, Phys. Rev. **D24**, 538 (1981);
S.L. Glashow and L.M. Krauss, Phys. Lett. **B190** (199 (1987);
S.M. Bilenky and S.T. Petcov; Rev. Mod. Phys. **59**, 671 (1987);
J.G. Learned, S. Pakvasa and T.J. Weiler, Phys. Lett. **B207**, 79 (1988).

[13] V. Berezinsky, G. Fiorentini and M. Lisia, hep-ph/9811352;
V. Barger and K. Whisnant, hep-ph/9903262;
V. Berezinsky, hep-ph/9904259;
J.N. Bahcall, P. Krastev and A.Yu. Smirnov, Phys. Rev. **D58**, 096016 (1998).

[14] L. Baudis et al., hep-ex/9902014.